

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/500,287  
Attorney Docket No. 042424

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of February 13, 2008.

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to replace the recitation "a selective reflection wavelength range of the cholesteric liquid crystal layer is in a range not larger than 350 nm" by "a selective reflection wavelength range for the cholesteric liquid crystal layer has an upper wavelength not larger than 350 nm."

Claims 1-2 and 5-9 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US 6,519,017 to Ichihashi et al. ("Ichihashi") in view of US 6,342,934 to Kameyama et al. ("Kameyama"), further in view of US 6,773,766 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer"), and further in view of US 5,548,422 to Conner et al. ("Conner").

It is alleged in the Office Action in particular that Conner discloses that a selective reflection range of not larger than 350 nm is inherent in a color filter like the color filter of Ichihashi (see Office Action at page 5, first full paragraph).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. As discussed at the interview of February 13, 2008, it is submitted that Conner is completely silent regarding a selective reflection wavelength range for the cholesteric liquid crystal layer has an upper wavelength not larger than 350 nm, as in the presently claimed invention. This is also immediately understood from the original

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/500,287  
Attorney Docket No. 042424

application, for example on page 21, lines 11 ("shorter wavelength side") and 29 (290 to 310 nm) as well as the Examples. An advantage of this feature is that a polarizing plate that is colorless can be obtained. The feature of the present claims is not taught or suggested in Ichibashi, Kameyama, and Meyer, and Conner fail to remedy this deficiency. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Nicolas E. Seckel

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 44,373

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep